



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,364	01/24/2002	Tomoya Yoshida	02036/LH	2010
1933 7590 06/12/2008 FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC 220 Fifth Avenue 16TH Floor NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708				
EXAMINER				
JOO, JOSHUA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2154				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/12/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10057364	1/24/02	YOSHIDA, TOMOYA	02036/LH

EXAMINER

JOSHUA JOO

ART UNIT	PAPER
2154	10

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief filed 04/05/2008 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

Applicant requested reconsideration of the information disclosure statement (IDS) filed 10/09/2007. Applicant submitted that the Japanese Office action dated August 2, 2007 and filed 10/09/2007 provided an explanation of relevance of these publications. Upon further review, the document "System security and operation management" will be considered. However, regarding the document "Integration management tool Patrol", other than being cited in the List of Cited Documents in the Japanese Office action, there is no explanation of relevance of the document in the Japanese Office action. Therefore, the document fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154